

### **REMARKS**

Claims 5-24 are pending in the application. All claims continue unamended. No new matter has been added.

### **ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

Claims 8, 13, 17 and 22 are objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims. Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 8, 13, 17 and 22 includes allowable subject matter.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS -35 USC 112**

Claims 6 and 19 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as being allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The language “a specifier referring to an object that is not present in the particular database system” is supported at least on page 13, lines 8-9 and page 17, lines 13-14 in the specification as originally filed. Therefore, this subject matter is clearly enabled as described in the originally filed specification because the specification clearly describes many features including the most common reason why a miss may occur, and redirection of cursor if required when the request contains a reference to an object that is not in the database.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request this rejection to be withdrawn.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS -35 USC 102**

Claims 5-7, 10-12, 15, 16, 19-21 and 24 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Laux (US 2001/0004737). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 5, and similarly claim 15, explicitly recites “if that is the case, redirecting that part of the execution to the other database system” (emphasis added).

Laux does not disclose or suggest at least this feature. Specifically, the abstract of Laux discloses that a single access operation enables access to a plurality of data sources where each data source in the plurality of data sources requires a different driver to access the data source so that there is a plurality of different drivers. Laux discloses using an application programming interface (API) for each driver in the plurality of different drivers. The API is substantially identical for each of the drivers in the plurality of different drivers. A merging driver receives the single access operation, and in response to the single access operation, the merging driver accesses the plurality of different drivers through the API. Therefore, Laux allows access to multiple data sources having different format by a single query.

Laux does not perform any redirection as claimed. In other words, Laux does not redirect any requests from a query engine of a database system to another database system. Providing a single access operation from a computer system to a plurality of data sources does not disclose or suggest redirection of a query from a data system to another data system. Laux discloses merging drives thereby allowing a computer system to providing a single access operation to access different data sources. Merging drivers merely provides single access operation from the computer system to access a plurality of different data sources and do not allow redirecting from the data source any request to another data source. Moreover, none of the different data sources of Laux disclose or suggest redirection as claimed. The different data sources of Laux do not redirect any requests by providing the request to another data source from the data source. Because the computer system or the different data sources of Laux do not disclose or suggest redirection, Laux does not disclose or suggest at least the feature of “if that is the case, redirecting that part of the execution to the other database system” (emphasis added).

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS -35 USC 103**

Claims 9, 14, 18 and 23 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Laux in view of Vange (US 2002/0002603).

As stated above, Laux does not teach or suggest “if that is the case, redirecting that part of the execution to the other database system” (emphasis added).

Vange also does not teach or suggest at least this feature. Specifically, Vange is directed to serving web-based content over a communication network. Requests for web content are

generated using a plurality of client applications coupled to the network. An intermediary server is coupled to the network to receive the requests for web content from client applications. A data server is coupled to the network and having an interface for communicating with the intermediary server. The intermediary server accesses the data server in response to receiving a request from a client application. Using the intermediary server, a web page is generated using the database content obtained from the data server. The web page is delivered to the client application that generated the request for database content. Therefore, Vange merely teach providing an intermediary server for web content service. Vange does not teach or suggest at least redirecting requests from a database system to another database system. Providing web content with an intermediary server is not the same as redirecting requests from a database system to another database system because providing the content of Vange does not redirect as claimed. Thus, Vange does not disclose at least the feature of “if that is the case, redirecting that part of the execution to the other database system” (emphasis added).

Therefore, Laux and Vange, singly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention as a whole.

### CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, all claims are believed allowable, and an allowance of the claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

To the extent that any arguments and disclaimers were presented to distinguish prior art, or for other reasons substantially related to patentability, during the prosecution of any and all parent and related application(s)/patent(s), Applicant(s) hereby explicitly retracts and rescinds any and all such arguments and disclaimers, and respectfully requests that the Examiner re-visit the prior art that such arguments and disclaimers were made to avoid.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Vista IP Law Group's Deposit Account No. 50-1105, referencing billing number OID 2001-092-01. The Commissioner is authorized to credit any overpayment or to charge any underpayment to Vista IP Law Group's Deposit Account No. 50-1105, referencing billing number OID 2001-092-01.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 6, 2010

**Vista IP Law Group LLP**  
1885 Lundy Avenue,  
Suite 108  
San Jose, CA 95131  
Telephone: (408) 321-8663

By: /Jasper Kwoh/  
Jasper Kwoh  
Registration No. 54,921  
for  
Peter C. Mei  
Registration No. 39,768